Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
95 678 SEP 28 1995
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1995

In re **JOHN LUCILLE,**

Petitioner,

v.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. BAUER *and*
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Respondents.

Corrected Petition For Writ of Mandamus *Pendete Lite* To The United States Court of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

John Lucille, *Pro se*
2741 W. Warren Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60612
(312) 826-6518

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

	Page
Statement of the Supplemental Appendix	i.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 7	ii.
Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) December 4, 1989, ...	iii.
Final Judgment Order, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	iv.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 8	v.
Plaintiff's Preliminary Reply to Petition to Enforce Settlement Agreement, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	vi.
Plaintiff's Notice to Strike and Dismiss - Motion In Limine, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	vii.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX (cont.)

Plaintiff's Certified Affidavit re: Death of Arnett, Gordon James, of Chicago, Illinois, U.S. Supreme Court Bar Member (9/9/93) ..... viii.

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) January 11, 1990, ... ix.

Minute Order of 4/27/95, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) the Honorable John A. Nordberg, presiding ..... x.

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) July 23, 1992, ... xi.

Civil Docket Sheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) p. 15 , line 207 ..... xii.

General Order, *Shakman v. The Democratic Organization of Cook County*, 69 C 2145 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) ..... xiii.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX (cont.)

Complaint, Coversheet, *Allen et al. v. City of Chicago*, 92 C 4122 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1992), the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen, Judge, presiding ..... xiv.

News Article, *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin*, (October, 1995) ..... xv.

Statement of the Supplemental Index

Pro se petitioner's index in support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus seeking "back-up" tapes to show court transcripts, dockets and orders fraudulently entered to damage petitioner and others similarly situated.

The first four documents show that Lucille's fired attorney, Sosman, took money under a fraudulent judgment, without consent, while employed by opposing party, City of Chicago. (S.App. ii.-v.)

Fifth and sixth are an appearance and motion filed by former U.S. Sup. Ct. Bar member, Gordon J. Arnett, indicating his intent to request access to "back-up" tapes for Lucille the day before he died on a "repaired" (rigged?) kidney dialysis machine where five others mysteriously died a few months prior. (S.App.v.,vi.) The affidavit (eighth) serves to show attorney Arnett is dead where the well-known attorney's death received little or no press. (App. viii.) Documents eleven and twelve show prior attempts by G. Arnett to secure tapes for other *Shakman* litigants prior to his death. (S.App. xi.,xii)

Seven is a motion by Lucilee demanding court tapes to show fraud which was filed several times in 1989 and in 1994 by Lucille. In nine, Lucille not listed Pro se on transcripts taken January 18, 1990, (labeled January 11, 1990) months after Sosman was removed by court order Nov. 17, 1989. (S.App.ix.)

Ten is judge Nordberg giving "blanket approval" to City of Chicago's reasons to deny Lucille's Motion to Reconsider. (S.App.

x.) Judge Nordberg offered no reason to indicate why Lucille's claims of fraud have no merit. Thirteen, Fourteen and Fifteen offer proof of efforts to control City of Chicago liability claims by federal judgeships to ex-City of Chicago corporation counsel. (S.App. xiii, xiv., xv)

CIVIL DOCKET CONTINUATION SHEET

Plaintiff Defendant

Docket No. 85 C 5956

LUCILLE, John, et al CITY OF CHICAGO, et al

DATE	NR.	PROCEEDINGS
11/14/89	76	Filed 11/013/89:Plaintiff John Lucille's notice of filing;
FMP		Motion for new counsel or (Pro Se); (Attachments).
11/17/89	77	Minute Order of 11/16/89:Filed defendants' motion for ruling pursuant to Local Rule 12(p). Court grants Steven H. Sosman's oral motion to withdraw as counsel for plaintiff John Lucille. Court grants John Lucille leave to proceed to trial pro se. Court requires response to pending motions by November 24, 1989, 1989 and completed final pretrial order by November 27, 1989. All parties must be present at pre-trial conference. Any plaintiff failing to appear on November 30, 1989 will be dismissed for want of prosecution. Copy of this order is being mailed to John Lucille, 2741 W. Warren Blvd. Chicago 60612. Trial briefs may be filed by December 8, 1989. Pretrial conference set for Nov. 30, 1989 at 4:30 p.m. Nordberg, J. Mailed notice 11/17/89.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, ORVILLE JONES and JAMES WHITE, Plaintiffs,	) Docket No.85C5956
v.	) Chicago, Illinois
	) December 4, 1989
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	) 5:00 o'clock p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN A. NORDBERG

APPEARANCES:
For the Plaintiffs
Jones and White:
STEVEN H. SOSMAN & ASSOCIATES, by:
MR. STEVEN SOSMAN
(188 West Randolph Street
Suite 1200 Chicago, Illinois 60601)
For the Plaintiff
Lucille: MR. JOHN LUCILLE, pro se

For the Defendant:
MS. NANCY VAN ALLEN
MS. MARY SMITH
Assistant Corporation Counsel
(180 North LaSalle Street
Suite 1408
Chicago, Illinois 60601):

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, ORVILLE JONES and JAMES WHITE, Plaintiffs,	)
v.	) No. 85 C 5956
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	)

FINAL JUDGMENT ORDER

This cause comes to be heard for the entry of Judgment and Final Settlement in the above cause with all parties given notice and the Court fully advised in the premises;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. That as the Plaintiff John Lucille has resolved his dispute with the Defendants, the City of Chicago, Charles Pounian, Eugene Barnes, William Sommerford and Lester Dickinson by way of Settlement Agreement, judgment is hereby entered in favor of the Plaintiff John Lucille and against the City of Chicago in the total of TWENTY ONE THOUSAND AND 00/100 DOLLARS($21,000.00) as damages and not as back pay, and inclusive of all costs and attorneys' fees.

tw.

2. That the complaint is hereby dismissed against defendants Pounian, Barnes, Sommerford and Dickinson, with prejudice and that the judgment is to be paid by the City of Chicago.

3. That this Judgment Order is a Final Order, and is entered in accordance with the Settlement Agreement which has been signed by all parties or the authorized representatives and filed with the Court.

4. That the City's obligations pursuant to this Final order shall be completed within sixty days of the receipt by the Defendants' counsel of a copy of the entry of the Judgment.

5. That judgment is entered against the City of Chicago and in favor of attorney Steven H. Sosman in the total amount of FOUR THOUSAND AND 00/100 ($4,000.00).

6. That on or before January 16, 1990, or upon receipt by defendants' counsel of a copy of this Judgment Order, whichever occurs last, John Lucille shall be further

afforded career service upon reinstatement to that position.

Dated: Jan. 18, 1990

Honorable Judge Nordberg

Steven H. Sosman
Attorney for John Lucille
7 South Dearborn
Suite 1318
Chicago, Illinois 60603
641-3755

ir.r.

CIVIL DOCKET CONTINUATION SHEET

Plaintiff Defendant

Docket No. 85 C 5956

LUCILLE, John, et al CITY OF CHICAGO, et al

DATE	NR.	PROCEEDINGS
01/22/90	91	Minute order of 01/18/90:Judgment is entered as follows: Court accepts settlement agreement dismissing all claims against defendants Pounian, Barnes, Sommerford, and Dickinson with prejudice and that the judgment is to be paid by the City of Chicago. Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiff John Lucille and against City of Chicago in the amount of $21,000.00 which includes all costs and attorneys' fees. Status hearing held. (For further detail see order attached to the original minute order form.) Nordberg, J. Mailed notice 01/22/90.
	92	Entered 01/18/90: Final judgment order.
...		
08/10/93	98	Filed 08/10/93: Appearance of Gordon James Arnett for plaintiff John Lucille.

R E C E I V E D
SEP 08 1993
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, et al., Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	No. 85 C 5956
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	)	JUDGE NORDBERG

PLAINTIFF'S PRELIMINARY REPLY
TO PETITION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT

This is a preliminary reply, because an adequate Reply cannot be filed unless and until Plaintiff has been allowed to listen to and/or transcribe portions of the electronic recorder TAPE of the hearing in the judge's chambers which ultimately led to the Settlement Agreement in this case. In Defendant City's Reply, no reference is made to any caselaw, primarily because there never has been any case, except for the one for plaintiff's friend and co-worker in the Sewer Department -- no case which was not either terminated at the Summary Judgment stage or by settlement agreement. Therefore, no legal research is required of plaintiff for his Reply Memo,

BL

The purpose of a Reply Memorandum is to reply to any issues or points raised in the Response. Here, Defendant City of Chicago contends--

"plaintiff shall be afforded seniority ... to July 16, 1980 and shall be afforded career service status" "and the City specifically disclaimed... any unlawful conduct against plaintiff (p.4)."

"In late 1992... the...General Assembly... provided for an Early Retirement Incentive Program..." "This Court can take judicial notice that the Fund... is a legal entity separate and distinct from the City of Chicago.

Defendant raises a crucial factual dispute in footnote #2, page 5. She argues that she "had no knowledge or information ... that plaintiff withdrew approximately $48,000 from the Fund subsequent to his" [rest of footnote missing, so we can't tell what else Attorney Mary L. Smith is trying to state.]

Then, when their memo continues with a reference to what Mr. Lucille may have understood during negotiations as to the "right to elect early retirement" requires the parties and their attorneys to listen to the electronic TAPE made by the court reporter. This is the only sure and binding way to learn what was actually discussed.

Plaintiff plans to file tomorrow (9/9/93) a Motion to Listen to Tape, after which he will seek leave to file a Supplemental Reply Memorandum.

Gordon James Arnett

GORDON JAMES ARNETT
Attorney for Plaintiff
5865 N. Lincoln Ave., #112
Chicago 60659
334-0400

bi.r.

RECEIVED
NOV 24 1989
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

John Lucille, et. al., Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	No. 85 C 5956
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	)	Judge Nordberg

PLAINTIFF NOTICE TO STRIKE
AND DISMISS - MOTION IN LIMINE

Plaintiff, by his (Pro Se) counsel John Lucille move to strike and dismiss all Motions-in-Limine. ...

To strike motion in Limine Plaintiff states as follows: ...

84 C 9978 - II Plaintiff need order From Court to Hear Voice Tape From Wzorek Trial.

RECEIVED
SEP 6 1994
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

RECEIVED
APR 20 1994
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

mL

On June 15th and June 29, 1984 Mayor Washington fired workers in violation of the Shakman Decree. The 27th Ward was half of the firing. There are 50 wards, how can one ward be half of the firing? Six out of seven supervisors were from the 27th ward. Tony of the 47th ward went back to work, that means 6 out of 6 were from the 27th ward. When workers filed law suits the city knew it was wrong. The Corporation Counsel took over and the big cover-up started. We checked with counsels in other placed and they said the people who changed the trial transcripts had to be crazy. They went to far when they took some of my testimony out, they forgot who I am. My testimony was over half Shakman. They will not get away with it. I have copies of everything. I pray for you to have the wisdom of King Solomon.

Dated at Chicago Illinois this 24 day of November 1989

Respectively Submitted

_____

John Lucille
Pro SE Counsel

2741 West Warren
Chicago, Illinois
(312) 826-7264

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

	Page
Statement of the Supplemental Appendix	i.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 7	ii.
Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) December 4, 1989, ...	iii.
Final Judgment Order, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	iv.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 8	v.
Plaintiff's Preliminary Reply to Petition to Enforce Settlement Agreement, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	vi.
Plaintiff's Certified Affidavit re: Death of Arnett, Gordon James, of Chicago, Illinois, U.S. Supreme Court Bar Member (9/9/93)	vii.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX (cont.)

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) January 11, 1990, ... viii.

Minute Order of 4/27/95, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) the Honorable John A. Nordberg, presiding ..... ix.

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) July 23, 1992, ... x.

Civil Docket Sheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) p. 15 , line 207 ..... xi.

General Order, *Shakman v. The Democratic Organization of Cook County*, 69 C 2145 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) ..... xii.

Complaint, Coversheet, *Allen et al. v. City of Chicago*, 92 C 4122 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1992), the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen, Judge, presiding ..... xiii.

News Article, *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin*, (October, 1995) ..... xiv.

Petitioner's Certified Affidavit

I, John Lucille, certify and declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1746 as follows:

1. That I am an adult, and competent to testify to the following in a court of law.
2. That I have continually requested "back-up" tapes from the lower district court and the Seventh Circuit appellate court through my own motions and through my attorneys, but have been denied the same.
3. That upon information and belief, Gordon James Arnett, my attorney, died by way of a defective kidney dialysis machine (9/9/93), the day after he made known his intention to request the tapes which would show fraud upon the court in 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.)
4. That numerous threats and attempts on my life have taken place for appealing the fraudulent judgments entered against me all because City of Chicago does not want to pay what it owes to hundreds of present and former employees unlawfully fired.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on Oct. 23, 1995

John Lucille PRO SE

John Lucille, Pro Se

Ill.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, et al.	) No.85 C 5956
Plaintiffs,	)
v.	)Chicago, Illinois
	)January 11, 1990
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al.,	) 9:30 a.m.
Defendants,	)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN A. NORDBERG

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

STEVEN H. SOSMAN & ASSOCIATES,by:
MR. STEVEN SOSMAN
(188 West Randolph Street
Suite 1200 Chicago,Illinois 60601)

For the Defendant:
MS. NANCY VAN ALLEN
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Labor Division
30 North LaSalle Street Suite 1020
Suite 1408
Chicago, Illinois 60602):

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

H. Stuart Cunningham
CLERK

Office of the Clerk

John Lucille
2741 W. Warren Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60612

Case Number 1:85-cv-05956
Title: Lucille v. Chgo, Cty of
Assigned Judge: Honorable John A. Nordberg

MINUTE ORDER of 4/27/95 by Hon. John A. Nordberg: Granting plaintiff John Lucille's motion to set a ruling date [152-1]. Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the 8/25/94 dismissal of his 4/20/94 joint petition to modify and supplemental petition for rule [141-1] is denied for the reasons set forth at length in the defendant, City of Chicago's response to plaintiff's motion to reconsider. For the same reasons, the court denies plaintiff's motion to strike the City's "response" to his motion to reconsider [145-1] date stamped 11/10/95.* Judge Nordberg's has been the presiding judge throughout this case. Plaintiff's claims have no merit. Mailed notice

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on April 28, 1995

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by ICMS, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

*Wrong date.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

EUGENE WZOREK,	)No.84 C 9978
	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	)Chicago, Illinois
	)July 23, 1992
CITY OF CHICAGO,	)9:30 a.m.
Defendant,	)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRIAN BARNETT DUFF

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:
MR. GORDON JAMES ARNETT
5865 North Lincoln Avenue, Suite 112
Chicago, Illinois 60659

For the Defendant:
MR. TERENCE J. MORAN
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Labor Division
180 North LaSalle Street Suite 1408
Chicago, Illinois 60601:

CIVIL DOCKET CONTINUATION SHEET

Plaintiff Defendant

Docket No. 84 C 9978

WZOREK, Eugene CITY OF CHICAGO

DATE	NR.	PROCEEDINGS
92	207	Minute order of 07/23/92: Plaintiff's motion to produce the court reporter's electronic recording tapes is denied. Duff, J. Mailed notice.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

In the Matter of	)	
Michael L. Shakman and	)	
Paul M. Lurie, et al.	)	
v.	)	Civil Action
	)	No.69 C 2145
The Democratic Organization	)	
of Cook County, et al.,	)	

GENERAL ORDER

It appearing that:---
(a) on 16 May 1983 the Executive Committee entered an order in the above captioned cause...
(b) ...
(c) ...
(d) the matter of the assigment of the petitions arising out of 69 C 2145 was discussed by the Court at its meeting on 15 November 1984, therefore

By direction of the full Court met in executive session on Thursday, 15 November 1984,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED ...

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That any petitions alleging violations of or to enforce provisions of the judgments and decrees entered in 69 C 2145 reassigned to the initial calendar of Judge Rovner as being related to 69 C 2145 be reassigned by lot according to the rules, provided that no such petition shall be assigned to the calendar of the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED ....

ENTER:

FOR THE COURT

Frank McGarr
Chief Judge

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 19th day of November 1984.

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

HENRY ALLEN, et al)
)
v.) 92C4122
)
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al.)

JUDGE ASPEN
MAGISTRATE JUDGE LEFKOW

COMPLAINT

7 in contention for seat on federal bench

By JOHN FLYNN ROONEY
Law Bulletin staff writer

Illinois' two U.S. senators have received the names of seven finalists for a district court vacancy in Chicago from the merit commission appointed by the senators. The finalists include ... Chicago's corporation counsel and ...two lawyers in private practice... The finalists are said to be: ...Susan S. Sher, who heads the City of Chicago's Law Department; ... and Joseph M. Gagliardo, a partner at Laner, Muchin, ... Gagliardo, 42, a former first deputy Chicago corporation counsel, said Wednesday he was thrilled about his selection as a finalist. ... Sher has served as corporation counsel since April 1993, and as first assistant corporation counsel from May 1989 until her elevation. The 47-year-old also worked as an associate and partner at Mayer, Brown & Platt, and as an associate general counsel at the University of Chicago four years before joining the corporation counsel's office.